

THE  
BOSTON MEDICAL AND SURGICAL  
JOURNAL.

VOL. XXV.

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 19, 1842.

No. 24.

RUPTURE OF THE UTERUS FROM EXTERNAL INJURY.

*To the Editor of the Boston Medical and Surgical Journal.*

SIR,—You can give the following case a place in your Journal, if you think proper.

On Jan. 1st, 1836, Mrs. Arnold, of Freetown, Cortland Co., N. Y., et. 35 years, who had generally enjoyed good health, had borne several children, and was at the full period of utero-gestation, having occasion to step out of the house, while walking upon the ice, fell, striking, with the entire weight of her body, the anterior of the abdomen, and producing a sensation (to use her own phrase), as if she were split open, in the belief of which she was persistent. Faintness followed at intervals, amounting to complete syncope, during the first twenty-four hours after the injury, with incessant vomiting, coldness of surface and extremities, countenance sunken, and a death-like aspect. The physician and friends in attendance supposed the case must be fatal, and had little or no confidence in any means which they could adopt. Under these circumstances, my partner, Dr. Miles Goodyear, was called, at the end of twenty-four hours after the injury had been received. He learned that there had been no motion of the child since the fall; patient complained of occasional abdominal pains; os uteri not in the least dilated; external appearance of abdomen natural, but extremely tender to the touch. Had been no evacuation from the bowels since the injury. Enemata were now administered, but not sufficiently retained to produce their desired effect. Reaction had now come on to some extent; pulse 110 and small; tongue thinly coated and dry; mouth of uterus still rigid and unyielding. Ordered 10 grs. of protochloride of mercury to be given, and repeated at the end of four hours, and followed by a dose of sulph. magnesia, which in the course of five or six hours produced free intestinal evacuations. Vomiting not so frequent, general symptoms nearly the same. It was now some ten or twelve hours since the arrival of my partner, who advised mild febrifuge remedies to be continued, and left the patient in charge of the attending physician, who stated that he should recal him on the least change of symptoms.

Accordingly, in about thirty-six hours afterwards, he was again called, when I saw the patient with him for the first time. We found her with countenance more deathly, pulse 120 and more feeble, tongue thickly coated and dry in the centre, less vomiting, tenderness of abdomen not so much, and patient did not complain of pain in this region, more than of

other parts. Bowels had moved freely, and evacuations not peculiarly offensive. The general appearance of the patient now indicated the delivery of the child, if it were ever to be done. But upon examination, we found no relaxation or dilatation of the os uteri, nor was the least effort on the part of the uterus to be discovered. We now proceeded with the steps of a forced labor and delivery of the child. Accordingly, the dilatation was commenced; a process so obstinately resisted by the unyielding state of the parts, as to require from four to five hours to effect a delivery of the child. It may not be improper to say here, that to produce sufficient dilatation in this case, for the accomplishment of the object in question, was no very inconsiderable labor, the hand of the operator requiring frequent intervals of rest, to enable it to accomplish its purpose. The child was large, and dead as was supposed previously, but no disorganization had yet taken place, and everything had thus far been accomplished independent of any proper or natural function of the uterus. Profuse hemorrhage now came on; the uterus not exhibiting the least contractile effort. The hand was immediately returned, detaching the placenta with facility until it arrived at the upper and anterior portion of the organ, when it met a resistance, which seemed to be a perfectly firm adhesion of the placenta and uterus, extending over a surface of from four to five inches, which could not be broken up with any prudent exertion. Patient was now much exhausted, extremities cold, pulse scarcely perceptible at the wrist, hemorrhage had nearly ceased. In this state of things we concluded that any further effort to detach the placenta would not only be unavailing, but inexpedient, and to separate the detached mass from the adherent portion would be attended with the most imminent danger. Patient was now placed in bed, stimulants freely given, with frictions upon the surface, and sinapisms to the wrists and ankles. We left the patient in care of the attending physician, four days having elapsed since the injury was inflicted.

At the expiration of twenty-four hours we saw the patient again; there had been very little hemorrhage, no movement of bowels, external appearances nearly the same as when we left. Patient expressed herself better than she had been before during her illness, but still the features were more cadaverous. An enema was given, which procured free and dark fetid discharges from the bowels. She now began to complain much of pain in the region of stomach. Singultus, and vomiting of a green, viscid fluid, of fetid odor, now came on; abdomen more distended, pulse much more rapid and feeble, and the already prostrated powers of the system unequivocally told that they would soon sink. In a few hours death occurred, it being the sixth day from the time of the accident.

*Autopsy, sixteen hours after Death.*—On opening abdomen gangrenous spots were to be seen on the inner surface of parietes for four or five inches around the umbilicus. Some portions of peritoneum adherent to intestines, while other parts were softened in structure. Much fetid gas escaped from the cavity. The next thing met with, worthy of note, was a full-sized and properly-formed foetus, with its extremities and body in the same relative situation in which nature had placed them in utero. The head and shoulders were lying closely upon the abdominal parietes,

to which a portion of the placenta was adherent, to the right and left of umbilicus, extending downwards, and laterally from three to four inches, the child lying anterior to all the abdominal viscera. Intestines mortified at various points. The friends objecting to a removal of the child, the facilities for further examination were not as ample as the case demanded. The rupture of the uterus occupied its superior and anterior portions, through which the child must have escaped, with its own placenta, at the time of the accident. Very little blood was found in the cavities, but a considerable quantity of serous fluid. It will be recollected that there was no external hemorrhage at the time the injury was received, and that there had been repeated evacuations from the bowels. It is certain that some contraction must have followed the rupture, from the absence of hemorrhage at the time, and that some inflammation supervened on the injury, which produced the adhesions met with in the effort to remove the placenta at the time of the delivery of the child.

In reviewing this case, the following question arises. Should not the Cæsarean operation have been performed at once after the receipt of the injury? Our conclusion was, that the operation was not advisable, for the following reasons. First, that the uncertainty of diagnostic signs failed in marking accurately the pathological conditions of the case. Secondly, that if the precise nature and extent of the injury had been ever so accurately known, the violent contusion sustained by some parts, as well as the laceration inflicted upon others, had made an injury which had already prostrated the powers of life very much, and if we now add to all this the necessary results of the above operation, we shall have an aggregate of cause which most certainly would not fail to produce a fatal termination, sooner than if the patient only suffered from the accidental injury.

Cortlandville, N. Y., Jan. 3d, 1842.

FREDERICK HYDE, M.D.

#### DR. PAINE'S REPLY TO DR. CARPENTER.

*To the Editor of the Boston Medical and Surgical Journal.*

SIR,—Will you oblige me with a place in your Journal, for the purpose of noticing a circular letter, addressed by Wm. B. Carpenter, M.D., to Professor Dunglison of Philadelphia, dated Bristol (Eng.), Nov. 16, 1841.

That circular refers to an imputation of plagiarisms, which I considered myself warranted in bringing against Dr. Carpenter, in a pamphlet entitled "Examination of Reviews," &c. Having exposed the remarkable tissue of misrepresentations which composes the review of my "Medical and Physiological Commentaries" (as appeared in the April No. (1841), of the British and Foreign Medical Review), and having, for very obvious reasons, drawn the offender from his obscurity, I then proceeded to inflict upon him, yet farther, what I regarded as a proper chastisement for the cowardly and wanton injury which he had attempted to perpetrate towards myself, and upon Dr. Forbes for admitting so malicious an article into his Journal, by exposing the plagiarism to which Dr. Carpenter's letter refers. The plagiarism was fully substantiated as it respects the Journal; and circumstantial evidence was submitted going

forcibly to show the probability that Dr. Carpenter was the author. That evidence was conclusive in my own mind till it should be rebutted by contradictory proof; and, of course, I had no doubt whatever that the public would sustain my conclusion on examining the nature of my premises. The repeated plagiarisms occur in the elaborate reviews of John Hunter's works, and of works by Carswell, Macartney and Rasori, contained in the April and July Nos. of the British and Foreign Medical Review, 1839, and occupying sixty-one (61) pages of the Journal. These authors, too, being pretty much used up by the reviewer, I considered it but an act of justice to the brightest ornaments of our profession to remove this slur upon their fame.

It is the object of the circular letter addressed to Professor Dunglison, to disclaim the authorship of those reviews, and this statement is accompanied by a letter from Dr. Forbes to Dr. Carpenter, in which Dr. Forbes remarks that,—"I shall take no notice whatever of his [Dr. Paine's] attack, farther than relates to the charge of plagiarism. *This is true*, so far as the writer of the review on Hunter is concerned, but *false* as concerns *you*—since you did not write that review. This I am ready to state to all persons, at all times, as the truth, without any reservation or equivocation."

I have also received a curious letter from Dr. Carpenter, stating that he is not the author of the reviews of Hunter's, Carswell's, Macartney's, and Rasori's works, accompanied by copies of certificates from two gentlemen to Dr. Carpenter, expressing their belief that he is incapable of an act of plagiarism. The letter also contains a reference to an article in the *Lancet* of Nov. 27th, from which it appears that it is the tendency of that article to exonerate Dr. Carpenter from the imputed plagiarism,—but which I have not seen. With the package came, also, the *certificates of character* supplied to Dr. Carpenter on the occasion of the review of his "Principles," &c., by the Edinburgh Medical and Surgical Journal.

This is all the proof with which I have been supplied in opposition to the various and forcible internal evidence of the imputed plagiarism. This evidence I know to have been generally considered ample in this country, as it appears to have been also in London. Indeed, this fact is prominent upon the very face of the circular letter. Such proof, therefore, can only be set aside by producing some other name as that of the author in question. If my proof be insufficient, it would seem to be obvious that the name of the plagiarist should be given to the world. This is alike due to Dr. Carpenter, to men of letters, and certainly to the dignity of Dr. Forbes himself. Indeed, till then, such as are disposed to exonerate Dr. Carpenter, must hold Dr. Forbes responsible. *Indignation* at so great a fraud upon himself should prompt a *disinterested* editor to expose the offender. Why does not Dr. Carpenter call for a disclosure of the author? This is certainly a most natural, as it would be a summary, mode of disposing of the whole subject. But again, I say, *where* is the *editor's self-respect*, that he does not expose the individual who perpetrated the indignity towards him? "The conduct of the writer of that review," says Dr. Forbes, "in *palming* upon the *Editor* a



portion of the writings of another for his own, *cannot be sufficiently reprobated.*" Then, I reiterate, give us his name, and "let justice prevail, though the heavens fall." Present us another name; and then we shall have another phenomenon added to those extraordinary combinations of coincidences which Cotton Mather arranged under the denomination of "Unaccountables."

But, why speak I of *self-respect* in relation to a man who professes the "truth *without* equivocation," and yet contradicts the principle in nearly every line of his letter? Does not the whole of his letter—I repeat it—bear an aspect from which truth recoils, as much as common decorum is startled at its low-born insolence? Take any passage in the solitary letter-page, and every unprejudiced mind will allow the justice of my criticism. What can be more wilfully false than the whole of the following? Thus:—

"In looking at the vast accumulation of words in Dr. Paine's pamphlet, I confess that I feel regret that the review of his book (just and accurate as I still hold it to be) was not more favorable; as it is melancholy to think that so much time and pains should have been stolen from tasks of usefulness, and expended in elaborating a work, which, of course, no human being will read, except the author himself, perhaps the writer of the inculcated article, and, alas, the Editor of the Review."

Here it is an obvious falsehood in affirming that he holds the review of my "Commentaries" to be "*just and accurate*," notwithstanding I have shown that the review is, throughout, a tissue of deliberate misrepresentations. Again, the opinion is not less falsely expressed, that "no human being will, of course, read the work except the author himself, perhaps the writer of the inculcated article, and, alas, the Editor of the Review." And what shall be said of Dr. Carpenter for appending this abusive letter to his circular, after the unatoned offence of misrepresenting my labors, and my character?

Again, Dr. Forbes states that my imputation of articles in his Journal to Dr. Carpenter is founded upon the editorial pronoun "*we*"; whereas, the *most important are directly claimed by Dr. Carpenter, in his own works, as his productions*; and where he refers to others in his review of my "Commentaries," I have shown that it is not in the ordinary way of editorial reference, but that he sets up a *claim* to the articles in question, of which the review of Hunter's works is one. Or take the following prevarication, by which Dr. Forbes would insinuate that Dr. Carpenter is not the author of the review of my "Commentaries," instead of a manly disavowal. "Perhaps," says Dr. Forbes, "when Dr. Paine discovers that he is mistaken in the affiliation of this portion of the Review, he may feel somewhat less confident of the evidence by which he thinks he has traced the authorship of other articles in it to you. I certainly shall not GRATIFY HIS CURIOSITY on this point, by either affirming or DENYING the accuracy of his conclusions; and I DO NOT SEE ANY REASON WHY YOU SHOULD." (*My capitals.*)

And why this wily advice not to admit or deny the authorship of the review of the "Commentaries"? Was it supposed that either might possibly invalidate the statement as to the plagiarism? Nevertheless, the

cunning of this advice is worthy its well-disciplined author, however it is a palpable admission of the very fact which he aims at concealing. But, I will soon add the paragraph upon which I had just commented in connection with another from Dr. Carpenter's letter, to exhibit more fully this lame attempt to insinuate the belief that Dr. Carpenter was not the author of the gross injustice which had been done to my labors, and of which Dr. Forbes still appears insensible.

That the author of the plagiarisms, whoever he be, should broadly deny it, seems almost a matter of course. It would be absurd to suppose him restrained by conscience; and it is equally important that Dr. Forbes, even with his sensitive conscience, should make it appear that Dr. Carpenter is not the author of the reviews which embrace the plagiarisms; since Dr. Carpenter having avowed himself, in the Preface to his "*Principles of Physiology*," the author of elaborate articles in the *British and Foreign Medical Review*, the proof of the plagiarism standing uncontradicted would be fatal to the *existence of that Journal*. But mark; as it respects the articles in question, Dr. Forbes affirms that those extensive reviews of four most eminent cultivators of medical science were "the first specimen he had had of this person's writing, and, with one trifling exception, the only one he had ever had"! *Credat Judæus!*

It will be recollected that the plagiarisms consist of thefts from the Rev. Dr. Channing's works, and that the imputation reaches to Dr. Carpenter's "*Principles of General and Comparative Physiology*." I refer to this, for the purpose of introducing the following coincidence from Dr. Carpenter's circular letter. "The ideas which I have expressed," he says, "have been so long familiar to my mind, that I cannot imagine that they involve anything peculiarly Channing-ian. If any correspondence do exist [!] it is easily accounted for by the fact, that I received my education from one, who was for many years the respected and attached friend of that illustrious man, and *WHOSE mind*, cast in the *same* mould with *HIS*, *impressed* MINE with those *habits* of thought, which had led to whatever *SIMILARITY* may present itself between *OUR* published opinions"!—(*My capitals and Italics*.)

Now, then, this remarkable fact never would have been laid before the world, but for two obvious reasons; namely, 1st, because the parallel readings which occur in my "*Examination*" are *convincing*; and, therefore, we have here, under Dr. Carpenter's own signature, in his very letter of denial, a full admission that I had ample ground for the imputation of plagiarism, even had I not been prompted by the wanton attempt of this individual to falsify the hard labors of my professional life. 2nd, the foregoing remarkable fact is stated, also, because it is more or less known that Dr. Carpenter was educated by one who was "for many years the respected and attached friend of *that illustrious man*,"—but a fact which was wholly unknown to me till I saw it stated in Dr. Carpenter's circular!!

Again, when such fluttering occurs among the most callous critics of this or any other age, can there be a more substantial proof that my imputation of plagiarism is powerfully sustained? Do *such* critics tremble but under a well-merited lash, and this, too, when applied by one whom they affect to hold in that indifference which is the never-failing resource

of defeat? Does not the whole world believe that my proof is clear, and does not the trepidation of the redoubtable critics evince their consciousness of the fact? And why does the world believe? Surely upon my *proof*, not my *dictum*. Dr. Carpenter says to me, "your charges [not *charges*] have been very generally believed among those who do not know me." And who are they that thus surrender their belief to an unknown foreigner against one of their own cherished and much-honored countrymen? Who are they that thus forego an indomitable and ever-glorious national pride, to do a mortifying homage at the shrine of truth? They are illustrious Englishmen—the most illustrious men of the age—such as *believe* only upon *proof* when character is impugned. Nor—I repeat it—was a humble republican of America at all likely to gain indulgence but upon the abstract merits of his cause. Let it then be known, that I distributed eight hundred copies of my "Examination" amongst the scavans of Europe, and in every instance, but one or two, their names are publicly enrolled as employed in the cause of science. To those same gentlemen I shall transmit these remarks.

And yet it is possible that I may be in error, and, what is very unusual, upon such a question, the intellectual world may be in error also. Let us then inquire, which is the greater offence—an act of plagiarism by a critic, or a systematic tissue of misrepresentations, by the same critic, of one of the most laborious works that has ever come from the medical press? To prove this falsification was the *main* object of my "Examination." Why, then, so much solicitude about the plagiarisms, and none at all about the *falsehoods*? Dr. Carpenter complains, in his letter to me, of the injury which will result to him from my imputation; and had there been one word of regret in that letter at the furious assault which had been made upon my labors, and even my character, it would have paralyzed my arm forever. But, he seems utterly insensible to the injury which would have resulted to myself from his libellous attack, had I not published that "Examination" under which he is now doing a bitter penance. There is, however, no parallel in our cases. I was marked as an innocent victim by the unprincipled editor, and his ever-ready scribe rejoiced in the opportunity. The dispensations of justice were against them. The guilty have fallen; and now they come before the world with a selfishness which is truly characteristic of the trade they follow.

I trust that the public will not be led away by the wailings of wounded pride from the main object of my "Examination of REVIEWS," which was to expose the scandalous system of reviewing by a part of the London medical press, which is mostly conducted by young aspirants who endeavor to sacrifice all but their own *cliques*, or, at most, lavish their praises upon the works of others which they know to have fallen "dead-born from the press." If our *par nobile fratrum* have been caught at last, shall they be permitted to effect their escape *under a cry* that is foreign to the great object of my "Examination"? I certainly feel but *very little interest* in the affair of the *plagiarisms*, beyond the fullest disposition to be just to others, and to sustain the truth. And, while adverting to the leading medical presses of London, as well, also, to show with what consideration the imputed plagiarisms were received in

Europe, I will take the liberty of quoting a paragraph from a letter which I have just received from as distinguished a philosopher as adorns the present age—premising, also, that I have not the honor of knowing him personally, or of ever having before received a communication from him. Thus:—

“DEAR SIR,—I beg to thank you for the copy of your ‘*Examination*’ which you were so kind as to send me, and which I had the pleasure of receiving a few days ago. The exposure of Dr. Carpenter’s plagiarism will do good. The whole system of anonymous medical reviewing in this country is disgraceful, conducted as it is almost entirely by the hands of a set of pert boys, at most but just emerged from their medical studies.”

Finally; it is unnecessary to say that there is no other attempt to escape from the proof by which I so variously identified Dr. Carpenter as the author of the review of my “*Commentaries*,” than the following prevaricating passage with which Dr. Carpenter’s circular letter commences, and which, of course, is equivalent to an admission of the authorship, however he may be disposed to screen himself behind his accommodating friend. Thus:—

“Having just received from Dr. Paine a copy of his ‘*Examination*’ of the Critique on his Medical and Physiological Commentaries, which appeared in the April number of the British and Foreign Medical Review, I find, to my great surprise, that Dr. P. has thought himself justified—not only in singling me out as the Author of it, and in animadverting upon what he considers to be its misrepresentations, as if they were mine, thereby attempting to make that a matter of personal discussion between us, for which the editor of the Review holds himself responsible,” &c.

This is all the atonement I receive for the wrong attempted by Dr. Carpenter; whilst he holds himself up as an injured man because he was unfortunate at the game he had undertaken. As to his “surprise at being singled out as the Author,” he should have considered more maturely the spirit of the following passage which occurs in my “*Examination*.” Thus:—“That great and dignified critic, Samuel Johnson, advises authors—‘to consider how they whom publication lays open to the insults of such as their *obscurity* secures against reprisals, may extricate themselves from unexpected encounters.’ It is obvious that one of the important expedients, in cases of this nature, lies in raising the veil, and surprising the offender.” That I was correct in *this* opinion, I presume that even Dr. Carpenter will most readily allow.

But, take a passage to which I have already referred for another purpose from Dr. Forbes’s letter, in which, with a view to protecting Dr. Carpenter against the charge of being the author of the review of Hunter’s, Macartney’s, Carswell’s and Rasori’s, works, he unwittingly avows that Dr. Carpenter is the author of the Review of Paine’s Commentaries. Indeed, he even founds an argument upon the avowal. The authorship being admitted, Dr. Forbes then proceeds to show that Dr. Carpenter must not be held responsible for other articles because he employed the editorial *we* in his reference to others, in his review of Paine’s Commentaries.

"It is singular that Dr. Paine should have been so ignorant of the ordinary mode of conducting a Review, as not to know that the reference from one article to another is no proof whatever of the identity of the authorship of the two—even when this reference is made by the writer of the latter article. But, most commonly, such references are made by the Editor, without any communication with the original writer, in the exercise of the privileges inherent in the office of the great editorial WE."

The foregoing is the shuffling to which I have before referred as misrepresenting the means by which I have connected Dr. Carpenter with various articles in the British and Foreign Medical Review. The impotent attempt which is made in the circular letters to imply that Dr. Carpenter is not the author of the review of my "Commentaries," in opposition to the various and overwhelming proof contained in my "Examination," and the simultaneous betrayal of this attempt at deception, as well as the other exposures which I have now made, divest the letters of all claim to credibility, even were not the parties arraigned for an offence which demands other proof of innocence than the mere negative of the inculpated. But, I also repeat it, these two letters not only establish the guilt of Dr. Carpenter as it respects his misrepresentation of my labors, and of my character, but go far to fix upon him the *stain of plagiarism*. In his future attempt to wipe away this stain, it will be well to express some contrition at the magnitude of the offence which was perpetrated in relation to myself.

I have always been sensible that I had but little to hope, at present, from the medical press of Europe; nor have I been mistaken in the estimate I had formed of a portion of the press in that part of the world. I have never apprehended, however, that full justice would not ultimately come, when this "*age of pamphlets*" shall have passed, and therefore I have looked with comparative indifference upon the treatment which I have received, though with a stern determination to protect myself against every act of injustice from sources entitled to consideration. That tears of editorial sympathy will now deluge the European hemisphere, cannot be doubted; but, whether the flood will be increased from this side of the Atlantic, time can only disclose. In the meanwhile, I shall prepare myself for the coming of the waters, and be ready with my Ark for a "nine days' storm."

I am, Mr. Editor, most respectfully yours,

New York, 446 Broome street.

MARTYN PAINE.

December 24, 1841.

P. S.—I shall esteem it a favor, as well as an act of justice, if those journals which may publish Dr. Carpenter's circular letter to Professor Dunglison, or other communications from Dr. Forbes relative to the imputed plagiarisms, will give the foregoing comments an insertion.

M. PAINE.

#### DR. JEREMIAH WILLIAMS.

[Communicated for the Boston Medical and Surgical Journal.]

DIED, in Warren, December 31st, Jeremiah Williams, M.D., Vice President of the Rhode Island Medical Society, aged 55 years. Dr. Wil-

liams has been for more than thirty years in very extensive practice, and well deserved the high confidence reposed in his skill. He also filled a wide sphere of action as an enterprising and useful citizen. He was one of the few surviving petitioners for the charter of the Medical Society in 1812; was active and efficient in establishing and supporting the Warren Seminary, the friends of which will long have reason to feel and lament his departure; and he contributed liberally to the support of other useful, benevolent and religious enterprises of his town. As a practitioner he was bold and efficient—thought for himself, and was a close observer of nature as well as reader of books. By industry and enterprise in mercantile and professional business he acquired a large estate, but when about ready to enjoy it in quiet retirement, he was, by the inscrutable order of Providence, summoned to another state of being, there to receive, as his afflicted family and friends have abundant reason to hope, the approving sentence of "*well done good and faithful servant.*"

P.

---

#### ON THE HARDENING OF THE UNGUENT. HYDRARGYRI NITRATIS.

THE action of nitrous acid and nitrate of mercury upon the fixed oils and fats has been pretty fully investigated by the continental chemists, and they have divided them into two divisions, viz., the drying oils and the fat oils, according to the effects that nitrous acid and atmospheric air have upon them. The former of these absorb oxygen on exposure to the air, becoming a transparent hard mass, but are not solidified by the acid. The fat oils, on the contrary, become solid when nitrous acid is added to them, to which the name of glaidine has been given, and which is solid at ordinary temperatures; but if a small quantity of any drying oil (as linseed, poppyseed, hempseed, or walnut) be added to them, it greatly modifies and retards their solidification.

Referring to the very different result, as to hardness and color, which has been obtained by different manufacturers of ung. hydr. nitr., Mr. Kemp says, "how to account for the difference which exists in the preparation when only olive oil and lard are used, is certainly a matter of considerable difficulty; it probably depends upon the manipulation and the proportion of the ingredients used; and I would ask, whether in some instances the fat oil may not have been contaminated with some oil of a drying nature?"

We had made a passing allusion to this subject in our notice of Dr. Liebig's work "on Oily Acids," before the receipt of Mr. Kemp's communication. It appears from Mr. Alsop's paper "on Ung. Hydr. Nitr.," that the two points upon which the success of the preparation principally depends, are the proportion of acid employed and the temperature at which the mixture of the acid solution with the fat is effected. We can speak from experience to the fact, that where due attention is paid to the strength of the acid, so as to make the equivalent equal to that ordered in the Pharmacopœia, the ointment never becomes hard or discolored. On the other hand, when the proportion of acid is deficient,



the hardening, we believe, always takes place. This uniformity of result, under the circumstances indicated, would seem to preclude the probability of the consistence depending upon the genuineness of the olive oil, as suggested by Mr. Kemp. We agree, however, with what appears to be Mr. Kemp's opinion, that the hardening of the ointment is most likely caused by the conversion of the oleine into the elaidine. The principal difficulty consists in accounting for the difference of effect where the proportions of acid are different, for if nitrate of mercury and nitrous acid are capable of converting oleine into elaidine, it might be inferred that the change would be most complete, and the ointment consequently the hardest, where the largest proportion of acid was used. But this is not found practically to be the case.

We would observe that the conversion of oleine into elaidine is not caused by the action of pure nitrate of mercury or nitric acid, but is due to the hyponitrous acid which is held in solution in recently made nitrate of mercury, and also in the fuming nitrous acid. It would be important, therefore, to determine whether the nitric solution of mercury made with excess of acid, as directed in the Pharmacopœia, contains as much hyponitrous acid as it would if the proportion of nitric acid were smaller. The subject requires a careful investigation, and would afford matter for an interesting paper at some future meeting of our society.—*Pharmaceutical Transactions*.

---

## BOSTON MEDICAL AND SURGICAL JOURNAL.

---

BOSTON, JANUARY 19, 1842.

---

### OBJECTS AND NATURE OF MEDICAL SCIENCE.

SUCH is the title of Dr. Bartlett's lecture (previously referred to) on the 3d of November, at Lexington, Ky. He commences by saying—"I am to teach the theory and practice of medicine, and I propose to devote the first hour of our official relationship as teacher and pupils, to an explicit statement of my own conception of some of the fundamental duties which belong to my department."

Knowing the character of Dr. Bartlett's mind, and the careful scrutiny to which everything is subjected that is brought within his sphere of thought, we were prepared for just the kind of discourse this proves to be—viz., a philosophical examination of the duties belonging to the chair to which he was recently elected. Dr. B. reasons: he is not accustomed to jump at conclusions. In defining the nature of the science and art of medicine, he displays that evidence of mature deliberation and power of analysis, which always commands respect, and influences the minds of others.

Men of high intellectual attainments will differ upon the question—in what does the science of medicine consist? It is as certain, too, that the schools will never agree harmoniously in the doctrines which are occasionally taught, as lately discovered principles. Great laws are ad-

mitted to exist, and derangements of the vital functions are also admitted, in individual cases; but how they are produced, or in what manner they can most readily and safely be restored, has kept the medical world by the ears since the age of Hippocrates; and though we by no means wish to alarm pathological peace-makers, we must be allowed to say that a medical millennium is still in the obscurity of the future.

"The true purpose of all *medical science* differs," says Dr. B., "in no respect, from that of the other sciences. I shall speak only of that department to which our own investigations are to be more particularly confined. The chair which I occupy and the branch which we are to study is designated by the title of "*The Theory and Practice of Medicine.*" It embraces the entire natural history of disease, and the best methods for its mitigation and removal. Its legitimate object is the investigation and ascertainment of all the phenomena of morbid action—the relations of these phenomena to each other, and to their causes—and, also, to those substances and agents in nature which are endowed with the property of influencing and modifying them. It is possible enough, that this announcement may seem to you, after all this apparent flourish of trumpets, no very momentous or important affair; but let me assure you, that, simple as it may seem, you will find it to be a principle pregnant, like all true principles, with almost infinite results."

We have room but for one more extract.

"There is one aspect in which the phenomena of the living economy, both in health and disease, approach very nearly in invariableness and absoluteness to those of inanimate matter. I mean when these phenomena are considered in great aggregates—on a vast scale. When this is done, we see these laws developing and manifesting themselves, with a majestic regularity, like that which carries the planets round the sun. Nothing can be more doubtful than the duration of life, for instance, in the case of a particular individual; but when the observation of this *fact*, the duration of life, is extended from one to a million or to a hundred millions, the *average period* becomes one of great certainty and correctness. Of two individuals born on the same day, and with apparently equal prospects of life, one may finish his career in an hour, and the other may reach the age of a century of years; but of a hundred thousand born in a given continuous period of time, the mean duration of life in the first fifty thousand will not probably vary, to *any appreciable extent*, from that in the second fifty thousand. The whole science of vital statistics consists of these extensive observations and generalizations. The same process may be applied, to some extent, to the phenomena of disease, and the result will be certain *general, approximative* laws—laws of *degree* or *proportion*, as we may call them. For instance, although nothing can be more uncertain, in the case of an individual who is exposed to the causes of tuberculous disease, in which side of the chest the morbid disposition will commence, still of a very large number, say a thousand, it may very confidently be predicted that two thirds will have the left lung affected before the right. In other words, observation seems to have established the fact, that in about two thirds of the cases of tuberculous phthisis, the morbid disposition *begins* in the left lung. This *predilection*, then, of the morbid element for the left lung, may be considered, properly enough, a *law of pathology*. Similar remarks may be made in regard to very many other morbid phenomena. But we are not to forget, that however absolutely and positively we may express these general laws—when applied to vast

aggregates—the practical and actual dealing of the physician is with individual cases :—and that here the law deduced from the great aggregate, as an average or proportionate result, may fail entirely in its application.”

We have known Dr. Bartlett here at the North a long while, and shall not, therefore, be inattentive to his prosperity. He has moved to a more genial climate, where we doubt not his talents are appreciated, and where the sphere of his usefulness will ultimately equal the deserts of a scholar, a candid medical philosopher and a gentleman.

---

*History and Progress of Phrenology.*—New things become old, and old ones sometimes become new. Such is the condition of the once novel, exciting, and now much-abused science of phrenology. Although advocated by some of the most profound men of the age, it has been the misfortune of phrenology to be the hobby of little minds, and hence the division of sentiment upon the subject.

The volume before us was published at Buffalo in 1839 ; but it is really, to us, a recent affair. It is a work of common sense, by a learned man, and therefore totally different in its character from the mass of treatises which have been elaborated in this country upon the same fruitful topic. The author is R. W. Haskins, A.M., the ingenious author of an admirable system of astronomy, designed for schools, which we hope will finally be extensively introduced in Massachusetts. Some of the plates are good likenesses : we recognized Dr. Spurzheim, Mr. Geo. Combe, and Dr. Charles Caldwell, as particularly accurate. We cannot very conveniently make extracts ; yet the plan and execution of the book is such as to commend itself to all friends of phrenology, far and near. In a literary point of view it will compare favorably with the writings of those who have made more noise in the world than Mr. Haskins, without being half as erudite, or accomplished in scholastic wisdom.

---

*Harvard University Circular.*—A catalogue of the members of the present class attending medical lectures in Boston, just published, has 118 names upon it, which is truly encouraging. The class has not been so large before, for many years. Since students cannot be better taught in any other place, there is no reason why the number should not be constantly increasing. Surely the facilities for obtaining knowledge cannot be questioned. The circular plainly states the course pursued in this excellent school, so that no one will be disappointed who visits it in the capacity of a pupil. Hereafter two full courses of lectures will be required in this institution, of candidates for a degree of doctor in medicine. But for one of these courses “a substitute may be received in a course of lectures at any other medical institution in which the number of teachers is not less than six, and in which the time occupied by lectures is not less than four months.” The idea is becoming extensively diffused, that the lecture terms, generally, in this country, are too short. Four months is thought better than three. Several schools are therefore modifying their old system of operations.

---

*Mortality of Boston in 1841.*—It is gratifying to speak of the good condition of the public health in this city. The number of deaths in 1841 was less than in 1840—being only 1919. The year was not characterized, as we have before remarked, by the prevalence of any epidemic, and yet

a considerable number of persons died of one or two diseases.—84 died of lung fever, as expressed on the official returns, 87 of scarlet fever, 37 of hooping cough, 108 of infantile diseases, 256 of pulmonary consumption, 28 of diseases of the heart, 57 of smallpox, 87 of measles, 55 of old age, &c. Such is the vigilance of the internal health department of the city, in speedily removing all offensive accumulations of decomposable matter from the streets, that notwithstanding the increase of population, and the prodigious daily influx of strangers by the railroads, and from the ocean, the city is unsurpassed in the general health of its inhabitants.

---

*Requisitions for becoming a Member of the Boston Medical Association.*

—A stranger, through the post-office, who wishes to ascertain the conditions for becoming a member of this Association, is informed that a professional gentleman, establishing himself in the city, simply waits upon the Secretary of the Association, and exhibits his testimonials—which must either be a medical degree from a reputable college, known to confer such honors, or a license from the State Medical Society. He signs the by-laws, and at once is in good fellowship with the members, who are notified of his admission. If the candidate, however, has not a license, he can apply to the Censors of the State Medical Society, who will examine him, and if qualified, grant one. He can then enter the Association, and is at once entitled to its privileges, without the payment of any matriculating fee. Medical strangers, of proper qualifications, are nowhere treated with more marked kindness, than by this excellent Institution.

---

*Comparative Anatomy.*—Those who investigated the structure of the orang outang skeleton which was prepared by a medical gentleman of Boston, some twenty years ago, have now a rare opportunity of examining the living animal, in Washington street, which may not occur again in half a century. Ten minutes devoted to the examination of the head, facial expression, muscular developments, and general external characteristics, of this fine specimen, will be more satisfactory to a man of scientific pursuits, than whole tomes of descriptive writing even from the highest authority.

---

*Principles and Practice of Obstetric Medicine and Surgery.*—From the press of Messrs. Lea & Blanchard, has been issued a very large and elegant volume, the first American edition, entitled "*The Principles and Practice of Obstetric Medicine and Surgery, in reference to the Process of Parturition, by Francis H. Ramsbotham, M.D., &c. &c.*," which has a more than ordinary claim to be carefully examined by medical editors, since the author is identified with all that can with propriety be called *improvement* in either of the departments to which this great work is especially devoted. As it is truly massive, we prefer to take time for its analysis, assuring the publishers, however, as well as the profession generally, that our impressions, even now, are decidedly favorable. There are one hundred and forty-two plates, and four hundred and fifty-eight royal octavo pages of text.

---

*Minute Anatomy.*—Generally, we pay no sort of regard to anonymous correspondents, because, when a man entertains honorable intentions, he

should never conceal his name. The writer of a note from New Hampshire, some weeks ago, who criticized pretty freely upon something of which he probably knew less than he imagined, will understand, by this, that he would be treated respectfully, if we knew to whom we were speaking. The technical expressions to which allusion was made, were correct. The sutures were not followed. If the divisions between the healthy and diseased parts had followed the natural line of connection, then the description would have been incorrect. The instrument swept through as related; and it is presumed besides that the account was correct, since it was thus related by him who had the skill to accomplish the difficult undertaking.

**Mortality in 1841.**—In Hillsborough, N. C., there were only 13 deaths during the past year, in a population of about 1000, besides about 150 scholars in the different schools—viz., 3 whites and 10 colored. There were 37 births—viz., 8 white males, and 7 white females; 12 colored males, and 10 colored females.

The number of deaths in Amherst, Mass., during the year 1841, in a population of 1565, is 31—19 males, and 12 females, exclusive of stillbirths. Five died under 1 year, 3 between 1 and 5, 2 between 5 and 10, 5 between 10 and 20, 1 between 20 and 30, 3 between 30 and 40, 3 between 40 and 50, 1 between 50 and 60, 2 between 60 and 70, 3 between 70 and 80, 1 between 80 and 90, 1 at 90, and 1 at 97. Although the season has been generally healthful, the proportion of deaths to the population of the town is large; 1 to 50½ very nearly. More than the usual number died at advanced age, making the duration of life about 34½ years.

The whole number of deaths in the city and town of Hartford (excepting West Hartford and the Alms House), during the year which has just closed, is 191. In 1840 the number was 188.

The whole number of deaths in the town of New Haven, for the year 1841, was 315—25 of whom were colored persons.

**New Medical Appointment.**—Henry Bronson, M.D., of Waterbury, has received the nomination for the vacant Professorship of *Materia Medica* and *Therapeutics*, in the Medical Institution of Yale College. This gentleman is well known as a classical writer, a profound scholar and a judicious medical practitioner: and the friends of the Institution will be gratified to learn that the chair is to be filled with such distinguished ability.

**MARRIED.**—In West Boylston, Dr. Josiah Abbott, of Marlborough, to Miss Arminda, daughter of Deacon Joseph White, of W. B.

**DIED.**—At Warren, R. I., Jeremiah Williams, M.D., 55.—At Vicksburg, Miss., Dr. Brown, in a quarrel.

Number of deaths in Boston for the week ending Jan. 15, 48.—Males, 24; Females, 24. Stillborn, 1. Of consumption, 6—disease of the heart, 2—suicide, 1—debility, 4—scarlet fever, 2—croup, 3—erysipelas, 1—inflammation of the bowels, 2—smallpox, 1—lung fever, 3—typhus fever, 1—convulsions, 1—dropsy in the head, 2—apoplexy, 2—intemperance, 1—pleurisy fever, 1—sudden, 1—rheumatic fever, 1—liver complaint, 1—disease of the brain, 1—infantile, 3—paralysis, 1.

#### MASSACHUSETTS MEDICAL SOCIETY.

THERE will be a Stated Meeting of the Counsellors of this Society at their room, Masonic Temple, on Wednesday, the second day of February, at 11 o'clock, A. M.

GEORGE W. OTIS, JR.

Recording Secretary.

J. 19—tm

## CASTLETON MEDICAL COLLEGE.

THE annual Lectures in the Castleton Medical College, late Vermont Academy of Medicine, will be commenced on the second Tuesday, 8th of March, 1842, and be continued fourteen weeks.

General, Special and Surgical Anatomy, by JAMES MCCLINTOCK, M.D.  
 Materia Medica, Therapeutics and Obstetrics, by JOSEPH PERKINS, M.D.  
 Principles and Practice of Surgery, by FRANK H. HAMILTON, M.D.  
 Theory and Practice of Medicine, by DAVID M. REESE, M.D.  
 Physiology, General Pathology, and Operative Obstetrics, by CHAUNCEY L. MITCHELL, M.D.  
 Chemistry and Pharmacy, by WILLIAM MATHER, M.D.  
 Ophthalmic Anatomy and Surgery, by WILLIAM C. WALLACE, M.D.  
 Medical Jurisprudence, by WILLIAM P. RUSSELL, M.D.  
 Demonstrator of Anatomy, EGBERT JAMIESON, M.D.

Fees for the course, \$55. Matriculating fee, \$5. Fee for those who have attended two full courses at other regular medical institutions, \$10. Expense of boarding, &c. \$1.50 to \$2.25.

In the last course a number of surgical operations were performed before the class; there is every reason to believe that the number of such cases will be much greater during the next term.

Castleton, Vt., Jan. 4, 1842.

J. 12.—2m

JOSEPH PERKINS, Registrar.

## MASSACHUSETTS MEDICAL SOCIETY.

CENSORS' MEETING.—There will be a meeting of the Censors for the First District and for the Society on Wednesday, the 26th day of January, 1842, at 4 o'clock, P. M., at the house of the subscriber, No. 9 Franklin place.

JOHN JEFFRIES, Secretary of Censors.

Boston, Dec. 27, 1841.

Jan 5—tm

## MEDICAL INSTRUCTION.

THE undersigned have united for the purpose of receiving students in medicine and affording them a complete professional education. The following are some of the advantages which are offered.

Students will be admitted to the medical and surgical practice of the Massachusetts General Hospital, and to the Infirmary for Diseases of the Lungs. At the Hospital, Dr. Bowditch will deliver a course of clinical lectures; and there, but more particularly at the Infirmary, the students will be practised in the physical examination of pulmonary diseases.

Occasional opportunities will be had for private practice in midwifery, surgery, &c., in one of the largest dispensaries of the city.

Arrangements have been made for an abundant supply of means for the study of practical anatomy, and students may feel assured nothing will be wanting in this department.

A meeting of the students for the purpose of reporting cases, and for medical discussion and criticism, will be held weekly, under the superintendence of one of the instructors.

Gentlemen, previous to presenting themselves for their degrees, will be specially and minutely examined in the different branches with a view to their creditable appearance.

A regular course of instruction will be given as follows.

On Diseases of the Chest, and Midwifery, by	DR. BOWDITCH.
Materia Medica and Chemistry, by	DR. WILEY.
Theory and Practice of Medicine, by	DR. SHATTUCK.
Descriptive and Practical Anatomy and Surgery, by	DR. PARKMAN.

Rooms for study, fuel, and light, free of expense.

For terms, apply to S. Parkman, M.D., 7 West street.

O. 13—coptf	H. I. BOWDITCH.	G. C. SHATTUCK, JR.
	H. G. WILEY,	S. PARKMAN.

## MEDICAL INSTRUCTION.

THE subscriber, Physician and Surgeon to the Marine Hospital, Chelsea, will receive pupils and give personal instruction in the various branches of medical science. He will devote to them such time, and afford them such opportunities and facilities for study and practice, as are essential for a thorough and practical medical education. The medical and surgical practice of the Hospital will be constantly open to his students, and clinical instruction, on the cases as they occur, will be given. Abundant facilities for obtaining a correct knowledge of materia medica and the dispensing of medicines will be afforded.—For terms, and more particular information, application can be made at the Hospital or by letter.

Chelsea, September, 1841.

Sep.8—coptf.

GEORGE W. OTIS, JR.

## INSTRUMENTS.

THEODORE METCALF, Apothecary, No. 33 Tremont Row, offers to surgeons and dentists, the best selected assortment of Instruments to be found in the city: consisting in part of Amputating, Trepanning, Obstetrical, Dissecting, Strabismus, Pocket, Eye and Cooper's Cases; Scarificators, Catheters, Bougies, Stomach Pumps, Injecting do., Spring and Thumb Lancets, Dissecting and Dressing Scissors, Trocars, Needles, Bistouries; Dressing, Dissecting, Polypus and Throat Forceps, Tonsil Instruments, &c. &c. of American and English manufacture.

Extracting Forceps, in sets of 12, or singly, of superior form and finish; Excavators, Burrs, Plug gers, Drills, Files; Cutting, Splitting and Punching Forceps; Gold and Platina Plate and Wire, Solder and Springs, Gold and Tin Foil, MINERAL TEETH, in great variety (much the largest assortment to be found in N. England), Grindstones, and almost every article used in the surgical or mechanical departments of Dentistry.

All orders from the country carefully and promptly executed.

D. 1.—6m

THE BOSTON MEDICAL AND SURGICAL JOURNAL is published every Wednesday, by D. CLAPP, JR., at 184 Washington St., corner of Franklin St., to whom all communications must be addressed, post paid. It is also published in Monthly Parts, with a printed cover. There are two volumes each year. J. V. C. SMITH, M.D., Editor. Price \$3.00 a year in advance, \$3.50 after three months, or \$4.00 if not paid within the year. Two copies to the same address, for \$5.00 a year, in advance. Orders from a distance must be accompanied by payment in advance or satisfactory reference. Postage the same as for a newspaper.